ing. Could you have found a man-perhaps one tation on such a declaration? I had, at that period, some intercourse with Southern gentlemen, and found them free to express a decided opinion that the institution was a curse to them; and I for my country when I reflect that God is just " But, sir, I must hasten to a conclusion: the

A Juster

sands of my brief hour are wasting. I have asked, is slavery of such high and holy origin as to give it sanction? Does it stand justified on the plea of humanity? Does it promote the best good of the country? Does it create the best state of society? Does it promote the peace and harmony of the country? Does it shed honor on erican name and character? What claim has it for extension under the Constitution ? Sir. I have given some attention to these particulars, and trust I have shown that the system, and es pecially the extension of the system, must fall when tried by any of these considerations.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me return to the bill under consideration. California stands at our door for admission, every way qualified to come into the family of States. Her Constitution is here, her members are here, and what hinders? Is not one State a large enough subject, or of sufficient importance to engress our attention in one bill? Must we load down this younger sister so far as "moral necessity" may demand, and conwith burdens too heavy to bear? Must we have sequently is exhausted in the act of giving the a compound dose? Must we make her carry a load to break down her high and noble spirit? Must she, and must the spirit of Freedom in this price for her reception? I have long observed that no measure which would not stand on its own merits was worthy to be carried at all. Sir, let us take one measure at a time—let us finish one job at a time, and especially a measure of so much importance as the admission of a State into

the honorable gentleman from Illinois, who has introduced a bill, embracing several important subjects. He declared, in his place, that he offered it as a peace-offering, and I doubt not his sincerity; but I very much doubt the propriety of the measure. And I will go further, and say, that beyond all question, in my mind, such a comof subjects of such magnitude is improper. It will certainly embarraes, for a time st, the admission of California, if it does not defeat it for a long period. What effect may we calculate this delay will have on the feelings the citizens of California, on her high-minded Senators and Representatives, ready, here, to enter upon their public duties? Are not the interests of California suffering and bleeding for want of legislation? and such legislation as her own representatives are best able to explain? our hardy sons there, and going there in multitudes? Does not every consideration of interest and honor press upon us the necessity of framediate action in her patriotic, to give her the cold shoulder, because there are other subjects of a national character about which we are not so well agreed? Must a man who has a clear title to his farm or his house-

known to be so to all—be kept from the possession of it because his neighbor has trouble about his title or his boundaries? It is unjust. I stand here, sir, the advocate of the immediate admission of California, alone; without any entangling alliances to distract her or to distract us. My vote is ready whenever the proposition is offered. She has prohibited slavery. I honor her for her wisdom. I rejoice in the triumph of freedom in her councils; and believe that under this banner she is destined to become a great and noble State. Perhaps—indeed it is almost certain-some of her cities are destined to become among the greatest marts of trade in the world California is now a valuable customer to her sister States, (if we may call her a sister.) she is rising in importance every day. How long shall we trespass upon her patience or keep from her those privileges and honors to which she is so

I cannot say what she may do. I believe she is loyal in her feelings, and ardent in her attachment to this Union. Let us not quench, by de-lay, those patriotic and holy fires that now burn in her bosom, but let us hasten to extend to her the hand of fellowship, that, in mutual harmony of feeling and action, we may mingle our efforts for the common good of our country—our whole

relation to the other Territories, it is my wish to give them Terriforial Governments, in which the Ordinance of 1787 or the Wilmot Provise shall represent, to vote, in all the stages of the business, the extension of slavery in any manner or

sentiment of the country, and perhaps of the world, on that subject. Sir, a philosopher once thought he could overturn the world with lever. power: this power, like that of the press, will do wonders; but the lever must have a falcrum, and the press must have some redeeming principles that belong to heaven or earth, before public opinion can be changed with regard to slavery, by its action. Talk of breaking down the spirit of freedom by a newspaper! The man would be wiser, who should take his bow and arrow, and, standing on the western steps of this Capitol, suppose he could, by a single shot, tunner the Alleghany. He might be vain enough to suppose the passage was opened through the mountain, but he would find it, on examination, unbroken and untouched. And so will the bulwarks of

But, Mr. Chairman, I have said nothing about the dissolution of this Union. Should I be fined, or suffer any penalty, if I should omit to do so? I confess sir, such a thought as the dissolution of this Union has not the faintest hold on my mind; and the responses that come up from the parts of the Union where I expected to hear the most of it, are so faint in support of the muchtalked-of Nashville Convention, that I am led to believe, that the fire which produced the sparks and smoke, in weeks past, has nearly, if not quite, gone out. I say, for one, let it die. I have no wish to disturb its sleeping embers. The People must govern; they will govern; and in their

VIRGINIA STATE CONVENTION.

We have the official vote on the question of ealling a Convention in VIRGINIA for the purpose of revising the Constitution of that State election for delegates will take place on Thursday, the 22d of August; and the Convention will meet in Richmond on Monday, the 14th of Oc-

20,466 Majority for Convention

SOUTH CAROLINA SENATOR -We learn from the Charleston Courier, that Governor Scabrook, of South Carolina, has appointed the Hon. Robert W. Barnwell Senator to Congress from that State, in place of Mr. Elmore, deceased. Mr. Barnwell is now at Nashville, in attendance on the Southern Convention. He was formerly a Representative in Congress, and for several years the able and popular President of the College of

THE NICARAGUA TREATY .- It gives us pleasure to state to our readers that authentic information has reached this Government, of the full approval by the British Government of the treaty happily concluded in this city between Mr. Secre tary Clayton and Sir Henry Bulwer, for the adjustment of all points of the Nicaragua question, as between the Government of the United States and that of Great Britain.

MARYLAND CONVENTION ELECTION .- The Baltimore American publishes a table, showing officially the vote cast at the recent election for and agains calling a convention to amend the Constitution. The result is:

Against a Convention - -

We regret to learn that the Hon. L. D. Camp-

bell, one of the Representatives from Ohio, he been suddenly called home by the dangerous indisposition of a member of his family. He has, we understand, "paired off" with a member of the opposite party, for the fortnight that he expects to be absent.

The New Hampshire Legislature met at Concord on Wednesday and organized. Mr. Richard Jenness was unanimously chosen President of the Senate, and Nathaniel B. Baker Speaker of the House—the latter receiving 197 out of 265 votes cast. It was expected that the Governor would

deliver his message the next day. GENERAL LOPEZ - We learn that the United

but could you have found ten men, twenty-five Cuba, to be arrested in that city, on the 7th inst, years ago, who would have hazarded their repu- for a violation of the act of Congress of the 20th of April, 1818. General L. was taken before the judge of the United States district court for ex-

THE NATIONAL ERA.

WASHINGTON, JUNE 13, 1850.

NON-INTERVENTION.

We call attention to the report on our first page of the debate in the Senate on the policy of Non-Intervention. It will be observed that there is a wide difference of opinion concerning the doctrine between General Cass and his Northern followers on one side, and his Southern friends on the other. The General holds that the Constitution confers no power on Congress to institute Territorial Governments-but, that as such Governments are necessary, Congress derives the right to frame them from "a moral necessity;" that this right should therefore be exercised only so far as " moral necessity" may demand, and con-Territories forms of government; that the right of legislation on their own concerns belongs to the People thereof; that, should Congress fail to give them forms of Government, their power of legislating for themselves would still be complete-and that this power embraces in its scope the whole question of Slavery as it affects them-

This doctrine was advocated by the Northern supporters of Gen. Cass at the late Presidential canvass, as the only true Democratic, national doctrine. On the platform of policy it contemplated, all sections might harmonize. While it was calculated to still agitation and maintain the harmony of the Republic, it would accomplish all that the Wilmot Proviso sought to effect. The People of the Territories were opposed to Slavery; and if left to themselves, would take good care to exclude it : besides, the Mexican laws probibiting slavery, were in force, and, under the Non-Intervention

doctrine, they would continue to operate. Now, we ask our Democratic readers to examine the debate reported on our first page. Let them compare notes with their Southern friends, and see how delightfully they agree. Mr. King of Alabama, commenting on the remarks of Mr. Douglas of Illinois, urging the policy of Non-Intervention, as proclaimed

charges him with delivering a Free Soil, Wilmot Proviso speech. Mr Davis of Mississippi kindly informs General Cass that he was supported at the South as the less of two evils, between which a choice had to be made. The doctrine of Non-Intervention, set forth by the standard-bearer of the Democracy in 1848, is characterized as the Wilmot Proviso in disguise-as the worst, most offensive form of slavery restriction.

What, then, do these Southern Democrats mean by Non-Intervention in relation to Slavery? Non-Prohibition, but not Non-Protection. They discard with contempt the dogma that Congress has no authority to legislate for the Territorics. They hold that the moment a Territorial Government is established by that body, the Constitution of the United States is extended by implication over the Territory, abrogating any local laws which may prohibit slavery; that it is the solemn duty of Congress to establish such a Government, and to refrain from interfering to prevent the extension of slavery. They demand such intervention by Congress, as, according to their view of the Constitution, extends Slavery, and protest against intervention by that body against this extension. This is their theory of Mr. Chairman, it has been common for some | Non-Intervention.

gentlemen to explain their position, and how they | As to the doctrine that the People of the Terturers in Territories belonging to the United States have the right to pass laws divesting of the establishing it, because if it may establish, it protect. Slavery !

> The bill reported by the Committee of Thirteen proposed to prevent the Territorial Legislature from passing any law "in respect to slavery." This clause was met with the most determined resistance by the Democrats of the South-They never would vote for it. What! make an other species of property! Prevent the Territorial Legislature from passing laws to protect property in slaves! A monstrous indignity! The clause gave rise to a debate which ran

through two or three weeks; and, at last, the freedom remain unbroken, notwithstanding all Southern Democrats accomplished their object: by the aid of three men from the free States, two of them Democrats, they succeeded in substituting for the words " in respect to slavery," the words stablishing or prohibiting slavery"-thus leaving the Legislature at liberty to pass laws to enforce the claims of slaveholders, and keep slaves in subjection, should they be introduced in the Territories. This change was made on the demand of the Southern Democrats, every one of whom, ex-

cept Benton, voted for it. We can now contrast Northern and Souther Non-Intervention-or, rather, the Non-Intervention of General Cass and that of Jefferson Davis

Davis Non-Intervention

1. Plenary power in Con-ress to establish Territoria

2. The duty of Congress to

establish such Government is imposed by the Constitu-

3. Congress has full right

4. The Mexican laws do

not continue in force in the Territories, being abrogated by the Federal Constitution.

tories, if Congress neglect to give them Government, must do the best they can, but they have no right to exclude

Cass Non-Intervention.
1. No power in Congress to establish Territorial Government.
The duty of Congress to

is imposed by "moral neceswhatsoever to legislate for the Territories, nor is it ne-1 The Mexican laws con-

tinue in force in the Territo ry till repealed by competent authority—which authority is found in the Territorial Legislature.
5. The People of the Terri-

tories, if Congress neglect to give them Government, have the right to govern them-selves, and exclude slavery.

7. Congress usurps power when it attempts to restrain the People of the Territories from establishing or prohib-iting or regulating slavery, as they please.

8. Non intervention means, leaving to the People of a Territory the decision of the question whether they will entertain or reject slavery.

Mr. Douglas protested earnestly against the

restrictive clause in the bill of the Committee of Thirteen, and particularly when it was amended on the motion of a Whig Senator from Georgia, so as to restrain the Territorial Legislature from prohibiting or establishing Slavery, leaving it the privilege of protecting it. He declared that the adoption of such a restriction was in the very teeth of the Nicholson Letter-that it would stultify the Democratic party-that it was an insult to General Cass, who had been struck down for standing by the policy of Non-Intervention. the report recognised "Texas as the rightful pre-But his Democratic brethren from the South were inexorable. Party weighs nothing against Slavery, in their estimation. They care more for the ascendency of the Slave Power, and their own domination, than they do for the feelings of General Cass, or the consistency of his Northern followers. On the motion of Mr. Douglas to strike out the restrictive clause, so as to leave the whole question of Slavery to be disposed of by the People of the Territories according to their own judgment, every Southern Democrat voted in the

The question arises, will the General and his Northern followers in Congress vote for a bill ontaining a complete and contemptuous denial of their boasted doctrine of Non-Intervention? Will they give the lie to all their previous declarations of opinion, and, to use the language of Mr. Douglas, "stultify" themselves and their party at the North? We fear they will. That moral necessity," the "higher law" of General lass, in which he finds a warrant for doing what the Constitution does not authorize, will doubtless be alleged in justification. If it justify an un-Constitution, why not beyond his creed? The moral necessity" which is a higher law than the Constitution is certainly a higher law than the Nicholson Letter. He and his followers in bol Houses will vote for a bill, denying to the people of a Territory the power to prohibit slavery, and | White then assemble at Baltimore in solemn Convention and resolve that Non-Intervention, that is, leaving to the people of a Territory the right to settle the Question of Slavery for themselves, is, has always been, and must be, the genuine, national, Democratic policy! Well, we shall see how many Democrats of the

North will join in this work of self-stultification. But let no Northern Democrat, who stands prepared to sustain this bill, with its utter repudiation of the doctrines of the Nicholson Letters have the hardihood hereafter to prate with lying tongue about wisdom of the Non-Intervention policy, the truly Democratic principle of leaving to the people of a Territory the right to decide for themselves the question of Slavery!

MESSRS. CLAY AND WEBSTER.

We ask the attention of our readers to the ourse of Messrs. Clay and Webster, as indicated

by their votes in our Congressional record. Mr. Clay, since the death of Mr. Calhoun eems to be regarded by the Slaveholding Interest, as its most efficient protector. No one can fail to observe that the tone of his speeches has undergone a change, which adapts them more to Southern feelings. He is less tolerant towards Northern sentiment, and appears more inclined to entertain propositions of amendment emanating from the slaveholding members. Thus, he oted for the area manter the Print Y sippi intended as a recognition by implication of slavery in the Territories, and against that of Mr. Chase, designed to exclude the implication. He voted against the application of the Ordinance of 1787, and for the substitution of the words, or prohibiting or establishing slavery," for the words "in respect to slavery," because the Pro-Slavery men insisted that the latter prohibited police regulations for the system. He voted against the motion of Mr. Hale to insert after the word "probibiting," the word " allowing "-a motion designed to prevent the Territorial Legislature from proceeding on the assumption that slavery was already in the Territories. He voted against the motion of Mr. Walker to abolish peon slavery. "We do not know," said he its minute operations, its relations to society, its effects upon the Indians, its tendency towards their civilization!" Recollect, peon slavery is slavery for debt, which by the miserable contrivances of law is made virtually perpetual and hereditary. What a wonderful civilizer it must be! He voted, too, against Mr. Baldwin's amend-

ment, declaring the Mexican laws prohibiting slavery in the Territories still in force. It will be recollected that in the Compromise resolutions submitted by Mr. Clay in the early part of the session, he affirmed that slavery did not exist in intend to vote, on the great questions relating to ritories have a right to legislate for themselves, the Territories, either by law or in fact—in his ed that Mexican laws prohibiting slavery in the Territories were still in force, a fact which should induce the North to desist from urging the Wilmoment. It is the duty of Congress to forbid did he not admit this fact. But, this doctrine in accordance with these principles, and against such legislation-to restrain the Territorial Le- was sternly denied by the South, so that, when gislature from prohibiting Slavery, and also from the whole subject was referred to a Committee of Thirteen, it was found convenient to omit any may prohibit it. But while the Legislature is to allusion to it. Since the report of the Committee ers of slavery intend to publish a paper in this city to vindicate the institution, and change the be forbidden to prohibit, it is a violation of the has been under discussion, the Southern Senators constitutional rights of the South to forbid it to have repeatedly and solemnly protested against the doctrine. Hence, when the time for voting came, Mr. Baldwin deemed it necessary to take the sense of the Senate on the question, to see whether the North was indeed to receive any equivalent for the sacrifice of the Proviso; and he put his amendment in a form embodying the doctrine in regard to the Mexican law, as promulinvidious distinction between slave property and gated by Mr. Clay himself. In the 27th section, after the word "slavery," in the 6th line, he moved to add these words-"it being hereby intended and declared that the Mexican laws prohibiting slavery shall be and remain in force in

> "The distinguished chairman of the committhe Senate that such is his understanding of the law; that, if we pass this bill, the Mexican law will remain in force; and he has gone so far as to affirm that, if it were not so, if such were not to be the law, he would himself be opposed to the bill; for he would never vote for any bill that would have the effect of extending slavery to Territories now free. My own opinion, sir, is in accordance with that of the distinguished chairman of the ommittee, that, if we pass this bill, the Mexican aws will remain in force prohibiting slavery, and that the Territorial Legislature will not have the power to repeal or change those laws, by its own legislation, under the provisions of this bill. But, that is not the opinion of other and distinguished Senators who have delivered their sentiments in the course of this debate. The Senator from Georgia, [Mr. Berrien,] for example, has, on the other hand, expressed the opinion that, by the establishment of Territorial Governments, the Mexican laws upon this subject will be abrogated, and that slavery may, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, which will then be in force there, be carried into those Territories, not-withstanding the original prohibition in the Mex-

the said Territories, until altered or repealed by

Congress." In the course of a spirited speech

sustaining his amendment, he said :

The object of my amendment is merely to de lare what we ourselves intend. We are enact ing a law which we wish the people to under-stand. How can we expect this, when Senators upon this side of the Chamber understand it in one sense, and Senators upon the other side of the Chamber say they understand it in a differ-

ent sense? " Let us, then, not deal with the people in a biguous language, but let us declare plainly, frankly, what we do mean; and when we have intelligibly expressed what a majority of the Sen-ate understand the law to be, if this bill is passed, then the people of these Territories will know from us what we intend to declare the will of the

Mr. Clay denounced this motion with great warmth, as an attempt " to get another form of the Wilmot Proviso introduced." "No, sir." said Mr. Baldwin, "it is the statu quo which I propose." "Mr. Clay. Very well; what is that statu quo but the Wilmot Proviso? Is it not equivalent to

the Wilmot Proviso? And will not one expres-

sion of this body satisfy the Senator from Con

nectical himself, without prolonging the discus-

sion day after day, lacking only a little variety o expression, upon substantially the same proposi Mr. Baldwin did not yield to the overbearing demeanor of Mr. Clay, but advocated his amendment with renewed spirit and vigor. Referring to a remark of Mr. Berrien, one of the Committee of Thirteen, that one of the propositions of prietor of the soil which the United States pro-

posed to acquire from that State." he said-"Now, sir, if Texas is to be deemed the right-ful proprietor of the soil and jurisdiction of the territory to be ceded to the United States upon the terms proposed in this bill, what will be claimed to follow? Why, sir, that the law of Texas, and not the law of Mexico, prevails over this entire Territory; that we receive it as slave territory, although, in point of fact, Texas has never for one moment exercised jurisdiction over States District Attorney at New Orleans, acting under instructions from the Department of State, is sued by direction of the President, caused Gen-

cral Lopez, commander of the late expedition to Cuba, to be arrested in that city, on the 7th instraight of April, 1818. General L. was taken before the Cuba, the Control and his control to the Control and his control is made-if he is corect in his opinion, that we shall recognise Texs as the proprietor of this territory, then, sir, i will follow that the Texan law—the law of slavey—will be claimed by Senators who concur win that distinguished Senator in opinion to be the aw of the Territory. It is, sir, to exclude any ach conclusion that I have

offered this amendmut.

Certainly, the reaons alleged by Mr. Baldwin were all-sufficient to how the reasonableness and necessity of his amerlment. But Mr. Clay could see nothing in it but he Wilmot Proviso, though a declaration of whathe himself had formerly asonstitutional act, why not an inconsistent one? serted as a Truth of aw-and he voted against If it authorize the General to go beyond the it. The following as the year and nays on the

> -Messrs, Jaldwin, Bradbury, Bright coper, Corun, Davis of Massachusetts, lodge of Visconsin, Douglas, Felch, iale, Hamin, Miller, Norris, Seward, Smith, Spriance, Upham, Walker, and mb-23.

"Nays-Messrs. Athison, Badger, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Borland, Bitler, Cass, Clay, Clemens, Davis of Mississipp, Dawson, Dickinson, Dodge of lows, Downs, Foce, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mson, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Soud, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, and Yulee-2.

So Mr. Clay, which the tenty part of the ses sion won praises at the North by his bold utterance of the "Truth of Law" that the Mexican Laws prohibiting savery were still in force in the Territories, wien the question was made practical, and it became important to have it settled by a solemn declaration, voted against the proposition affirming this Truth.

Let us hear no more of Henry Clay's liberal

sentiments on the Savery Question. So much for one of the most distinguished leaders of the Whg party. Let us review the votes of another of them, Mr. Webster. We shall not go back to the time when Mr. Webster decided the question of a Compromise Committee against the North, subsequently, however, when his vote could not turn the scale, giving it for the North. That is his way.

June 5th, when the Senate began to vote on the amendments to the Omnibus bill, he supported the provise of Mr. Chase to the amendment of Mr. Davis of Mississippi, and, when it was lost, voted against that amendment. The virtue of these votes is somewhat impaired by the fact, that there was scarcely any probability that either of the amendments would pass. The proposition which was really intended to be passed was that of Mr. Berrien of Georgia, inserting the words, "prohibiting or establishing," instead of "in respect to," so as to leave the Territorial Legislature at liberty to protect slavery, should it creep into the Territories; and for this, Mr. Webster voted, in company with Mr. Sturgeon of Pennsylvania, Mr. Dickinson of New York, and Mr. have stood-yeas 26, nays 31.

Then came the motion of Mr. Hale, to prohibit very, and here again we find Mr. Webster voting Jones and Sturgeon, from the free States. Mr. Webster did not use to be found in such company.

On the question of abolishing peon slavery, he stood shoulder to shoulder with the same gentlemen, voting against its abolition in company with the slaveholders, and with Messrs. Bright, Cooper, Dickinson, Smith, and Sturgeon. (Mr. Cass, the great enemy of Austrian oppression, and all sorts of white slavery, was unfortunately absent, dulged in no personalities, no invective; his to defy the solemnly expressed will of their conwhen this vote was taken. Can any one tell how he would have voted ?)

Yulee's amendment. The moment the vote on this amendment was announced, Mr. Baldwin introduced his amendthis time, was absent during the spirited discussion that arose, and also when the question was taken on the amendment. As Mr. Baldwin offered his amendment the moment the result of he vote on that of Mr. Yulee was announced, as Mr. Webster voted on the latter, and his name is the last but two on the record, he must either have disappeared while the votes were being counted, (a process which occupies scarcely more than two or three minutes.) or when he saw Mr. Baldwin rise with his amendment. Our strong parture. We must recollect that, whatever may be the private views of Mr. Webster, he has not at any time during the present session given the least intimation of his opinion in regard to the important question on which almost every leading Senator has expressed his sentiments-the question whether the Mexican Laws prohibiting slavery are in force or not in the Territories. Had he been present when the question was taken on have been tested. He must either have voted yea or nay. The fair presumption is that he chose to

do neither, and therefore absented himself. Enough-will any idolater of Henry Clay or Daniel Webster please inform us what the cause of Freedom and of Progress has to hope from their counsels or efforts? Preserve the record we have given of their votes, as well as that we give in another column of the votes of Mr. Cass. It will be useful hereafter. If the men of Buffalo of 1848 be true to themselves, Hunkerism in 1852 will receive its eternal quietus.

THE SENATE AND PEON SLAVERY.

It is marvellous with what tender assiduity the Senate watches over the interests of Slaveryhow promptly it repels any movement that may remotely affect them! After the Wilmot Proviso had been voted down a few days ago, after all amendments intended to guard the interests of Freedom in the Territories had been rejected, after an amendment securing a contingent advantage for slavery had been carried, Mr. Walker of Wisconsin moved to insert next to the word slavery," the following-" And peon slavery is abolished and forever prohibited in the said Territory? Under the system of promage, a person may be

sold for debt, and held in servitude till he shall work it out. The system is so contrived as to make the bondage not only perpetual, but hereditary; and it is penal for any employer to take into his service a subject of such bondage, without a certificate from his former employer, that he has no claim upon him. There is now a large number of peons in the Territories; the system is in active operation; and it has no respect to color. White Americans, if they should be unfortunate, might find themselves reduced to this servile condition, without hope of release. What possible objection could an American body of legislators have to the abolition of such oppression? But Mr. Walker's amendment was at once opposed by Southern Senators, who raised the cry of interference with vested rights! Mr. Dayton of New Jersey, unreasonably acquiescing in this notion, moved to amend by restricting the operation of the amendment to the future. Pending this, an adjournment was moved and carried. The subject was resumed the next day, (Thursday, June 6th.) when Mesers. Seward and Douglas advocated the abolition of the system, and Messrs. Hunter, Rusk, Foote, Clay, Dickinson, &c, insisted that Non-Interference was the safe policy. Mr. Douglas said, he, too, would favor this policy, had not the Senate, the day before. resolved not to leave to the People the business of legislating for themselves. Since the Senate had disregarded Non-Intervention in the case of African slavery, he did not see any good reason for abstaining from intervention in the case of peon slavery. He went for the abolition of system which made slaves of white men.

But the slaveholders did not appreciate such

the following vote:

the following vote:
YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Benton, Bradbury,
Chase, Corwin, Davis of Massachusetts, Dodge of
Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Felch,
Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Norris, Seward,
Shields, Spruance, Upham, and Walker—20.
NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Bell, Berrien, Borland, Bright, Butler, Clay, Clemens,
Cooper, Davis of Mississippi, Dawson, Dickinson, Downs, Foote, Houston, Hunter, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Pearce, Pratt, Rusk, Sebastian, Smith, Soulé, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Webster, and Yulee—32.
Benton, the only Senator from a slaveholding

Benton, the only Senator from a slaveholding State, voting for its abolition, while Senators Bright, Cooper, Dickinson, Smith, Sturgeon, and Webster, from the free States, voted against its abolition-three Whigs and three Democrats. Gen. Cass was absent. On nearly all the incidental questions springing up in connection with slavery, it will be found that the slaveholders, acting in a body, carry enough Northern men with them to accomplish their purposes.

A SCENE IN THE SENATE. MESSRS. DAWSON AND HALE.

Mr. Hale is one of the best tempered and me humorous members of the Senate; and withal, distinguished for his boldness, readiness, and independence. No one more studiously avoids offensive personalities; but he has rendered himself obnoxious to many by the ardor with which he defends the cause of freedom, the promptness with which he exposes every insidious assault upon its interests, and the frequency of his reference to the sentiment and will of constituencies represented by Northern Senators about to yield

to the demands of the Slave Power. Besides, he is entirely destitute of superstition reverence for great men, being as apt to dissent from Mr. Webster, or oppose Mr. Clay, or to make merry with the inconsistencies of General

Cass, as if they were ordinary flesh and blood. Such freedom and irreverence could not be suffered to go unrebuked. The sensibilities of Senators who had been annoyed by his constant efforts to save freedom from being wounded by professed friends, the feelings of "leading men." whose leadership he had rejected, demanded the condign punishment of the culprit. Last Saturday was the time chosen for his public humiliation, or 1 Me, Dergon of Georgia appeared on the executioner.

The subject under discussion was the boundary power of Congress to reduce the boundaries of a Rynders would not have been guilty of an act like sovereign State, and denounced the attempt to that. The protestations were so earnest against purchase the soil of Texas and turn it over to the the motion, that he was obliged to withdraw it, Federal Government, as an attempt which, if but, saying that he would adjourn himself, he Jones of Iowa, the only Senators from the free slave soil into free soil. This placed Mr. Foote, Up rose Daniel Webster at the same time, and States in the affirmative. Had their votes been a supporter of the project, in a dangerous position, moving about as if to draw followers after him, recorded against the amendment, the vote would and he rose to protest against the construction took his hat and disappeared. Mr. Cass followed dently thinking of his constituents alone, he be- seat, and other Senators seemed half inclined to the Territorial Legislature from "allowing" sla- came vehement in his declamation, declaring that imitate these magnanimous leaders. We cannot the bill, if passed, would be a death-blow to the but infer that all this was preconcerted, with a nay, in company with the slaveholders, and with monster Free Soil-would cover it with infamy- view to mortify and abash Mr. Hale, and leave Messrs. Bright, Cass, Cooper, Dickinson, Dodge indeed, that by the votes of the Senate already him to make his defence to empty seats. upon amendments, the Wilmot Proviso had been remarks were pointed, but so humorous as to stituents. excite general, almost unrestrained laughter

arraignment. Mr. Dawson arose with a clerical solemnity; the Senate was stilled; every Senator

ning the existence of the Mexican was in his place; the leading men settled them-The speech of Mr. Dawson bore every mark of elaborate preparation. He commenced by expressing his profound grief that the Senator from New Hampshire should take advantage of any unguarded expression of a brother Senator, with a view to excite sectional feeling. It was not Senatorial-it was not patriotic. And then he expatiated upon patriotism, nationality, magnanimity, justice; insinuating, not asserting, that in all these attributes the Senator from New Hampshire was sadly deficient. He seemed to pity him; to feel mortified rather than angry with his petty sectionalism, his cunning appeals to prejudice and passion; but he consoled himself with a few reflections on his own high attributes-For himself, he meekly claimed unspotted purity, all-embracing patriotism, the most exalted humanity, and a magnanimity unquestionable.

And was he not magnanimous? In the first place, he was sustained by the united Southern delegation, with, perhaps, a single exception then he had, we presume, the cordial sympathies Mr. Baldwin's amendment, his position would of the Northern Senators of both parties, with the exception of Messrs. Seward, Baldwin, Corwin, Chase, and Hamlin. With a legion to back him, with upturned faces all around him prompt to greet with smiles his feeblest witticism; with Clay by his side to cry, "hear him, hear him;" with Badger in front to interject assent; and with Cass just beyond, with his heavy countenance almost kindling with delight, it was very magnanimous for that Senator, without notice, without pretext, to undertake, in a speech prepared beforehand, with documents and papers furnished him by some seavenger in politics, the public arraignment and condemnation of a Senator, standing almost alone, with no party to rally in his defence. and totally unapprized of the attack about to be made. It was a magnanimous act, Mr. Dawson-a beautiful illustration of Georgia chivalry.

After pronouncing a high-wrought culogium upon himself, he alluded with touching eloquence to the frailties of other Senators, not actuated by the same exalted motives. Why, at this hour of peril, throw obstacles in the way of an amicable settlement of our controversies? When grayheaded patriots were taxing their energies to save the noblest fabric of Government the world had ever seen; when Northern men, with a generous disregard of self, were laying their prejudices and pride on the altar of the country-why should they be stigmatized as enemies to free dom, traitor. to the interests of their particular section? An-Webster and Clay looked unutterable things, and Hale, of course, was supposed to feel self-reproach for the irreverence he had manifested for their joint wisdom and works.

Mr. Dawson proceeded to impeach, in the most courteous manner, the purity of Mr. Hale's motives; not formally, but by implication. He indulged in dark invendoes about former acts and ppinions in the history of that Senator, ringing he changes on inconsistency, sudden conversion, self-aggrandizement, and the like, till he had raised curiosity to its utmost, and predisposed the Senate for a development which should cover the New Hampshire Senator with confusion of face. And then he read a manuscript copy of a letter written by the Rev. George Storrs in 1835, about a certain abolition meeting held in Dover, New Hampshire, at which Mr. Hale stood forth as the champion of the anti-abolition party. Next he held up a newspaper, (a copy of the Dover falsely ascribed to Mr. Hale, ridiculing the Aboliionists, and inviting popular vengeance against that British emissary, George Thompson. He disclaimed anything personally offensive to the New Hampshire Senstor. Oh, no! that Senst had the best heart in the world, if it were at lil er:y to act in obedience to the dictates of his own judgment. Mr. Webster and his friends laughed at this, as a most felicitous stroke. No, Dawson continued, these documents that he read were not diagraceful to the Senator fron "Hear him! hear him!" cried Mr. Clay. M Badger amented in an undertone. Mr. Webste

Mr. Dawson then branched out into general remarks on changes in public men, the influence of party and political motives, making frequent allusions to the self-seeking of political demagogues the self-aggrandizement constantly kept in view by agitators and sectional declaimers, giving the whole such an application, in connection with the documents he had read, as to favor the presump tion that Mr. Hale, in changing his views, had been actuated by a sordid ambition, regardless of the peace or welfare of the country. He did not charge this upon him in so many words, but what was the burden of his speech? That in 1835, Mr. Hale was a violent anti-Abolitionist; in 850, he is a vehement anti-slavery man; the documents showed it. Mr. Hale, then, had changed his position. Why? Either from honest conviction, or from motives of self-interest. Would Mr. Dawson have occupied an hour in a studied speech, discoursing of patriotism, and denouncing sordid self-seeking, and in general terms assuming change to be proof of profligacy, with the sole purpose of proving that Mr. Hale had become an honest convert to anti-slavery principles? No; his intention was to suggest, without formally charging, that Mr. Hale, in becoming an anti-slavery man, had been actuated by a low motive of personal aggrandizement. To make the charge openly would be a violation of the order of the Senate; would be so palpable as to disgust men of fair minds; would be inconsistent with that sweet courtesy and notable magnanimity which the Georgia Senator so greatly affects. But insinuated slander is decorous; imperchment of integrity, by invendo, is in order; suggestion of scoundrelism is consistent with the warmest profession of personal respect; to take his brother by the beard and say, "art thou well, my brother?" while he plants the dagger under his fifth rib, is in the style of the highest chivalry.

preconcerted exhibition of Senatorial vengeance. Mr. Dawson had gone through his speech, and was protracting the close of his remarks in a tedious way, as if to give notice to the Senators that the spectacle was over, and they now might go. On every principle of fair dealing, Mr. Hale was entitled to be heard in defence; but, reader, what think you? Mr. Clay rises in such a way as to attract general attention, and moves an adjournment! Yes, the high-minded Henry Clay, whom we have been accustomed to regard as above any petty baseness, sat by, listening with delight died attack upop a fellow-Senator - souraging the assailant by his exclamations, and then, moved an adjournment so as to deprive that Seqof Texas. Mr. Davis of Mississippi denied the ator of a chance to reply! The immortal Captain successful, would result in the conversion of walked deliberately out of the Senate Chamber given to the proposition by his colleague. Evi- with similar formality, Mr. Badger left his

But we have not done with this apparently

We have described and denounced this shamekilled and buried out of sight and hearing. Mr. less, unprovoked attack on Mr. Hale, not because Hale, ever ready to expose the true bearings of he needs our sympathy or support-he is a match the measure before the Senate, in a few humorous for all his enemies-but that the people of the but piquant remarks, called the attention of free States may understand what means are used Northern Senators inclined in favor of the bill in the Capitol to crush the spirit of freedom, to to the exposition of its nature and effects as given | browbeat its special advocates, and keep in counby one who was, in fact, its originator. He in- tenance those Northern men who have resolved

A word to Mr. Dawson. Some scavenger, against Mr. Hale, found certain documents in New Hampshire annals, showing that Mr. Hale. some fifteen years ago, was a strong anti-abolitionist. They are put into Mr. Dawson's hands, who

That is one kind of Senatorial magnanimity. We will show him another kind.

Some time during the session, somebody, anxious to use a Senator as the instrument of his spite against Mr. Seward, put into the hands of a Senator of Mississippi a speech formerly delivered by him at Cleveland, expecting that the gallant member would jump at the advantage thus offered him. He was disappointed. The Senator carried the speech over to Mr. Seward, stated how it came into his hands, and told him that he did not feel at liberty to avail himself of such means of attacking him. The Senator is bold and severe opponent, but an honorable one.

DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTA TIVES, LAST WEEK.

Last week the House was almost exclusively occupied, in Committee of the Whole on the California Question, holding morning and evening sessions, for the purpose of giving an opportunity to members who wished to deliver their views. The speeches were of course confined to one hour each: Some were read, some spoken; one was merely announced, the orator simply desiring that it might be considered as having been delivered. No effect on the minds of members was expected to be produced, but Representatives deemed it necessary that their constituents should know that they were at their posts. For the most part, empty seats rewarded the labor of the orators.

Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, in his speech on the 4th, said the whole question was in the hands of the imperious North-he was in favor of running the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific, opposed to the Senate plan of compromise, and the admission of California as a State. John A. King of New York made an animated speech, in which he said he would vote for

the Senate Compromise, if he thought it would terminate the controversy, but he did not believe it would receive the sanction of the People. He insisted on the President's plan of adjustment. Mr. Bingham delivered a strong speech, in which he advocated the same views on Slavery he had expressed several years ago, earnestly

urging the Wilmot Proviso. To the Nicholson

letter he ascribed the defeat of General Cass and the Democratic Party in 1848. Mr. Booth of Connecticut insisted on the admission of California as a State, argued with force against the extension of Slavery, and replied particularly to the arguments of Mr. Alston of Alabama on the Bible view of the sub-

Mr. Howe of Pennsylvania spoke in the evening, advocating California and the Proviso, denouncing the so-called compromise of the Senate, as full of wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores. He begged the Chairman to remember (for, as the seats were empty, he would have to prove everything by him) that he was in favor of at-taching the Dane Proviso, the Webster Proviso, the Wilmot Proviso, alias the Ordinance of 1787. He did not care if it was called the Jefferson Proviso, or the John Smith's Proviso— he was in favor of prohibiting slavery in the Territories, and preventing the admission of any more slave States, and abolishing Slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia. If this was not done, remove the seat o

Mr. Venable of North Carolina liked the can dor of Mr. Howe-he preferred the bold assassin to the midnight robber.

A compromise may be patched up, but the result will be that we shall be buried so deep that no hand of resurrection will or should raise us. no hand of resurrection will or should raise us. He was fresh from his constituents. He addressed them yesterday; and he told them that if they instructed him to vote for the so-called "Adjustment," he would not obey. California had sprung up like Jonah's gourd—not, however, for as good a purpose, for that shielded the prophet's head—but had sprung up to take from the South her constitutional rights. He was willing to run the line of 36° 30° to the Pacific, through the Territories, and make the Sierra Nevada one of the boundaries of California. Then give Territorial Governments to Utah and

New Mexico, west of the Rio Grande. H would give to Texas all of her territory, and would not consent to offer her a bribe to part with a portion of it. He defended the rights of uth; and, in the course of his remarks, the South; and, in the course of his remarks, said that he never meant to live where there was no slavery. If it were removed to-mcrrow, he would be in favor of it the next day.

Mr. Taylor of Ohio did not see any " bleeding wounds" in the country; he was in favor of the President's plan; as to a dissolution of the Union, the Capitol would crumble in dust before

the People would listen to the idea. At half past nine, the House adjourned.

JUNE 5. Mr. Jones of Tennessee gave notice of an mendment he intended to offer to Mr. Doty's bill. It is substantially the plan of compromise under discussion in the Senate, with two or three amendments, one, striking out the clause imposing a restriction on the Territorial Legislature as to Slavery.

Mr. Dunham of Indiana deprecated excitement-blamed the conduct of ultras in both sections-held that Congress had constitutional power to pass the Wilmot Proviso, but it did not therefore follow that it ought to use it-and believed that the Mexican law prohibited Slavery in the Territories. Mr. Johnson of Tennessee had a resolution

which he intended to offer, read, instructing the Committee a Toxiberies to report a bill for the admission of California, and for the recognition of the Governments already existing in New Mexico and Utah, and for the retrocession of the District of Columbia. He advocated compromise and conciliation, and

said, if the several propositions in regard to Slavery were separated, he should hold himself unnmitted as to his action. Mr. McLean of Kentucky was not in favor of

the Senate compromise-he was in favor of something like the President's plan-it was an improvement on the Nicholson letter-but he did ot like either.

Mr. Hoagland of Ohio opposed the purchase of Texan territory, and advocated the ground of Non-Intervention with regard to Slavery in he Territories. It would save the country from disastrous consequences. It was the doctrine of the great Democratic party, to which he belonged. He had maintained it in the election of 1848, on the stump and elsewhere, and he saw no reason for departing from it now. The extremes of both sides, he said, are anxious that the agitating questions shall not be settled. [Mr. Hoagland is informed that Non-Interven

tion has been voted down in the Senate by Southern Democrats.] Mr. Tuck charged upon the pro-slavery minor-

ty waste of time and delay of public businessadvocated the Wilmot Proviso-opposed the Senate compromise-denounced the Nashville Convention as unfit to be named the same day with the Hartford Convention. Mr. Dimmick of Pa. advocated the admission of California-contended that Slavery does not exist in the Territories-was opposed to all legis-

lation by Congress respecting it, of course, to the Wilmot Proviso-Insisted that the people of a Territory ought to be left free to exclude or Mr. Bowie of Maryland favored the Senate compromise, and enlogized Mr. Clay, considering

him as the second Moses in the desert surround Mr. Dickey of Pennsylvania said that his con

Mr. Dickey of Pennsylvania said that his constituents have always been opposed to the institution of Slavery, because they believe that it is opposed to the interests of society; and he was opposed to its extension, and gave his reasons for being so. He replied to the objections urged to the admission of California, and was in favor of immediately giving her a place in the Union. In the evening, Mr. Meade defended a speech

made by him some months ago-advocated Stuvery-denounced fanaticism, and told the Whigs for materials to gratify a weak malice and Democrats that they must put it down, or it Mr. Hubbard of Alabama rose to inform the

Committee what the demands of his constituents are. They regard the territory acquired from Mexico as common property. Any juggling to keep them out of it will not satisfy them. They expect to get it. His respect for the place would forbid him from saying what he thought of gentlemen if they do not divide. His constituents intend to have a part. "You had better let them have it?" he researched, if I tall you for them have it?" he researched.

own good." [Laughter.]
He proceeded to show that the slaves of the South are better fed and clothed, and have more given to them out of their labor, than the sgrigiven to them out of their labor, than the sgri-culturists of Earope; and their lot is infinitely superior to that of seamstresses who work for eighteen cents a day. He likewise referred to the large number of whites in the prisons and poorhouses of the North. There was more infi-delity within sight of Boston than among all the negroes of the South. Giving notice that he in-tended to write out his views, he took his seat. The House adjourned about 10 celock The House adjourned about 10 o'clock.

Mr. Caldwell of Kentucky called upon the Democrats to come to the rescue. There was not a Northern Whig from whom they could expect anything. He was for the doctrine of Non-Intervention. If the House would give Territorial Governments to New Mexico and Utah, without the Proviso, he would vote for the admission of

California : otherwise, not. Mr. Root of Ohio said-The North have always manifested their feelings of hostility to slavery; yet the South ven-tured to bring in this territory, and run the chance of its being made slave territory. The people of the North were all one way; and there would be nothing of doughfacery here, if they were honestly represented on this floor. The Wilmot Proviso was the dread of the South, but

Wilmot Proviso was the dread of the South, but it had made California a glorious new State, and free. And this was glory, and more than glory enough. He then paid his respects to Mr. Winthrop, who, he said, dodged, sneaked away, during the earlier part of the session, to avoid voting for the Proviso. The gentleman had said that he [Mr. Root] had set a trap to catch him. If he had desired to catch that gentleman, he should not have baited his trap with the Wilmot Proviso. [Laughter.] There were other heis to be so. [Laughter] There were other baits to be made use of; and if he had one of them he might count on a capture.

Mr. Johnson of Arkansas said the North held but one principle—that of excluding the South from the Territories. He denounced Mr. Stanly's speech-advocated the Missouri Compro mise-repudiated the doctrine of Non-Intervention-was proud that he had urged the holding of the Nashville Convention-said that those of the South who denounced it were false and cowardly. Finally, he urged the support of the Southern organ, about to be established here.

Mr. Dunean of Massachusetts was for the admission of California as a State, for the erection of Territorial Governments with the Proviso, for the abolition of the slave trade, for an amendment of the law of 1793, increasing the number of judges and officials in the case of fugitive slaves and securing the jury trial; and he warmly com mended the sagacity evinced in the President's

Mr. Duer introduced a substitute for the bill of Mr. Doty, providing for the admission of California, for the settler:ent of the Texan boundary question on the principles of Mr. Clay's Omnibus bill, and authorizing the People of the Terri tories of Utah and New Mexico to form State

In the evening, Mr. Jackson of Georgia pealed to the generous feelings of the North for justice. He went for the Missouri Compromise

line.

Mr. Durkee of Wisconsin regarded the great struggle as a glorious war—a war between truth and error, between liberty and despotism. The nation will rise from its degradation, and reassert he Declaration of Independence. Gentlemen say elavory must not be agitated nor discussed. Why not? Agitation in the very life of a republic; it is the great element which sustains it. There is no way to establish harmony, order, and justice, without it. We are sanctioning here what we is the great element which status in a retroit of the country. We are sanctioning here what we denounced on the seas as piracy, namely, easiaring the hodies and souls of men, women, and children. Gentlemen say, "Hush! do not agitate this question, we have a great mission abroad." This is gross hypocrisy. He charged it on the whole country. We profess to despise the traffic, and yet tolerate slave marts here, in the centre of the Union.

The Committee found itself without a quorum about ten o'clock, and after eleven, the House ad-